



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PUBLIC - SPEAKING WORK IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL.¹

THE rather broad title of my paper needs some definition. By "public-speaking work" I mean all that is generally spoken of under the head of elocution — oral reading, declamation, debating, the preparation and delivery of original addresses, voice culture; in short, the whole province of oral expression. What ought to be the place of work in oral expression in the high school?

Now, there is another question which naturally comes first to anyone who thinks about this subject: What *is* the place of oral expression, what work is done in oral expression in the high school? Very little. I make that statement unhesitatingly, though I have frankly to confess that I do not know much about what is done in the Connecticut high schools, and shall have to ask you to govern what I say by your knowledge of what is done there. I take some pains to find out what has been the preparation in this work of the boys who come to Amherst College. I know a good deal of what is done in the Massachusetts and New York schools. So far as concerns these schools at least, my statement is true; and I believe it to be true generally of schools throughout the country. Considered by itself, the work in oral expression is little, and less still when compared with the work done in any other important educational subject.

The case is very different from that of written expression. Those who teach English in high schools know what a vast deal of attention has been given to that subject of late years, and what strides it has made in our curricula. Compare the amount of attention now devoted to composition and rhetoric with that of fifteen and twenty years ago. There *is* no comparison. Then compare that work with the attention given to declamation, debating, the training of the voice. Again there is no comparison.

¹ A paper read before the High School Section of the Connecticut State Teachers' Association, October 17, 1902.

I can sum up the results of my investigation into the amount of this work done in Massachusetts high schools thus. You will be able to tell whether the summary holds good for Connecticut also. In few or no Massachusetts high schools is there any work in debating as a part of the regular school work, though a considerable number have debating societies connected with the school, and these are given some encouragement, a little criticism, and practically no training or assistance by teachers.

In declamation the case is the least bit better. Very few high schools make declamation any part of the regular school work, but many have occasional, and some regular, school exercises, in which declamations are delivered. So in these schools a few boys and girls have a little opportunity for work of this character. But the training or rehearsal for these exercises is at best slight and is generally wholly wanting.

If one were entitled to judge from the few reports I have from Connecticut schools, one might think Connecticut somewhat more attentive than Massachusetts to this kind of work. But at the very best, making all possible concessions, it is evident that the schools do not consider work in oral expression a very important educative influence. Why not? Well, there are more reasons than I can mention here, but these are some of them.

In the first place, there is a rather widespread impression that training in speaking in the high school is *futile*. If we could expect to turn out a good many Websters and Everetts, or even such orators as Senator Hoar and Senator Lodge, we should probably work pretty hard at it. But we know that there are not many such orators, and we have a vague notion that, at least so far as delivery is concerned, these men are self-trained. As for our lawyers and our clergymen, whom of course we expect to be good speakers and whom we criticise severely when they are not, we feel that the law school and the theological seminary, with perhaps some training in college, ought to be sufficient preparation for them. As for the teachers, it rarely occurs to us that they are the most frequent speakers to considerable audiences. We feel, in short, that the high school is for the *average*

boy, who may be anything as a man, but who pretty certainly will not be a public speaker, and that consequently the average boy does not need to be trained in speaking.

Another reason is a general distaste on the part of cultured people for public elocution. The extravagance, the tawdriness, the insincerity of the ordinary public reader disgust us, and we cry out upon the training which gives us that kind of thing, we incline to feel that all declamation or recitation is a sort of insincere and flashy show and pretense, not a real thing. A third reason — one which I find has a very great weight with some of the finest minds — is a feeling that public-speaking work, especially debating, is harmful to real culture and real scholarship; that in place of a devotion to the truth and an eager pursuit of it, it substitutes the advocate's spirit, the partisan spirit, than which in the domain of scholarship and culture nothing can be worse. They feel that it is training a man to show that black is white, to make the worse reason appear the better, and they revolt at such a course.

But by far the most important reason of all why we lack confidence in such training is the fact that very few of us ourselves have had it. We have not known its educative value in our own lives. How can we appreciate, then, the value it might have in the education of others?

Now, personally I am very deeply convinced of the great educative value of training in speaking. I want to make clear to you some of the grounds of that conviction, and I shall be glad if as a result any of you may be led to attach more importance to this kind of work.

The objection that the high school cannot set itself to the training of future Choates and Websters is a valid one. The problem for the high school, whose place in the state is the training, not of specialists, but of good and useful citizens, is this: Why should the high school give the average boy, who may become anything that is respectable, the opportunity and necessity of spending a good deal of time and hard and well-directed work in learning to speak well?

Because the man who cannot speak well is only half a man,

and only half fitted for good citizenship. He is just as truly, if not just as much, to be pitied as the man without legs or without arms. What would you think of a boy who trained himself to play football by carefully studying everything that has been written about football and all that the best coaches can say about football, but never ran a step, never caught a ball, never tackled a man, never broke through a line, till the day of a match game? You know that is an impossibility, and that if it were a possibility such a boy would be out of the game in just about two minutes. Now, that is just the condition of the man who cannot speak. He is out of the game of life, or at least the part he plays in it is small. You think, very likely, that that is exaggerated. You know any number of more or less successful men, especially business men, who never made a speech in their lives, who would be simply frightened if they were obliged to talk ten consecutive minutes to an assembly of any kind. But I did not say anything about making a speech. I said the man who cannot *speaking well* is only half a man. It is very true that nearly every man has at some time or other to make a speech, and that not many can do it well; something might be said about that; but this, at least, is true, that we do most of our work in this world with other men and through other men, and we act upon them mostly by talking to them. For writing well the schools strive hard to give adequate preparation, but for one opportunity to influence others by writing, the ordinary man has a thousand opportunities to influence others by talking. The man who talks best, other things being equal, will be the most successful. The superior effectiveness of some educated men over others, declares President Eliot, lies not in their greater stock of ideas, for among educated men the stock of ideas is pretty constant and equal in value, but in their greater powers of expression.

Our boys cannot live their lives by themselves. They cannot be business men by themselves, any more than they can be preachers or lawyers or teachers all by themselves. Even if they are to be physicians or engineers or artists, they live with others, have beliefs which they want to induce in others, wish to influence others about a hundred things, and have to do it by talking

to them. They tell us that this is not the orator's age; it is the business man's. Even in the legislatures and Congress speech-making does not amount to anything any more; all the business is done in committees. Well, just because the committee is there for business, nowhere is good speaking more necessary — not speeches, but good speaking. Time is short; facts, not mere words, are wanted. The man who means to make his views effectual there must know how to express them clearly, concisely, forcibly, and he must be able to get clear ideas out of the verbose and puttering statements of others. That is being business-like.

And that is what I mean by "speaking well;" to be able to put your feelings and your opinions on any occasion in such a form as will accurately and clearly and concisely set forth just what you believe and feel, and in such a form, moreover, as will be effective to make others think and feel as you do. How many of us can do that? And yet does not every one of us desire and need to do it?

Yes, though we follow the fashion and preach with strenuousness to our pupils the doctrine of accomplishment, of doing rather than talking, by the very preachment we admit the necessity of the right kind of talking. Not much does a man accomplish by himself. The man with an idea, a purpose, must nearly always put that idea into the heads of others, must imbue them with his purpose, before idea and purpose can become a great fact.

Well, then, if this is so, has not the average citizen, to whom the high school has given a stock of ideas and purposes, a further great claim upon the school, that it shall teach him how to make his ideas effective, how to transmute purpose into accomplishment? And if it is true that a good deal of this transmutation depends upon good speaking, ought not the high school to teach its pupils how to speak well?

Now, some of you who have agreed with me thus far, perhaps, may be inclined to offer an objection here. You may say: "Admitting that this training is desirable, oral reading, declamation, debates, and so on are not the only means of obtaining

it. A good talker has to be a good thinker; clear thought produces clear expression. We train boys to think, and to think clearly. And we can point to many a good talker who has not had the kind of training which you are advocating."

I am ready to admit that this is a strong objection and largely true. If I were to try to point out what is weak and untrue in it I should need a good deal more than this hour. But this much I will say:

1. Look at the boys and girls whom you are graduating this year. Of how many of them are you prepared honestly to say that they are good talkers? And of those who are not, how many do you feel sure will have the opportunity and the means to become such hereafter?

2. You have been training these boys and girls to think. In the case of how many of them do you feel honestly satisfied with the results? If you are not wholly satisfied, and if, as I suppose most of us believe, the power to think well is one of the greatest aims in our education, ought not we to welcome any work which will contribute to this result, even if we have to throw over for it such memorizing and such observation as does not seem to contribute to this result? And if the training in speaking should prove to be helpful also in training the pupil to think, ought not we to welcome it? I believe that the right kind of training in speaking is one of the most admirable of the means of training in thinking.

3. Does not this objection that good thinking will produce good expression fail wholly to take into account the training of the voice? And do not the voices of our pupils in general woefully need training in force and clearness, in enunciation, in attractiveness and beauty? I am content to leave the answer of that question to you. For myself, I assert that the culture of the voice is one of the greatest deficiencies in our whole system of culture, and that one of the crying needs of our schools is constant practice in vocal calisthenics.

Now, whatever we may think about the amount of training which our pupils receive toward good speaking or talking, and whatever may be our estimate as to the number of high school

graduates who now talk well, I think I may count on your agreeing with me that the power to talk well, to talk pleasantly, sincerely, genuinely, clearly, forcefully, in family and friendly conversation, in business and professional life, is a desirable thing; that it is more necessary to the average man than the power to write well, upon which English teachers expend so much effort, and that we ought to strengthen the training toward that power whenever we can in our high schools.

Now I am going to indulge in some suggestions as to ways and means of so increasing our training, and as I do so I shall find occasion to make a little clearer in some places, perhaps, the value of more training and the need of it. My suggestions are not startlingly new; they consist mostly in reinforcing old ways.

Debating.—First, the high-school boys, and girls too, ought to have a large opportunity and a considerable necessity for debating. And they ought to have good training in debating.

It is in debating that our boys get today their chief opportunity for training in speaking; for in many of our schools there are debating societies to which a certain number of boys belong, and which are maintained with a considerable degree of interest. I believe in these societies most thoroughly, and one of my suggestions is that every high school ought to have one and that large high schools ought to have more than one.

There can be no question as to the value of debating, and I hardly need to lay any stress upon it. It forces the constant endeavor to set forth clearly and effectively one's own ideas; it trains one to think on one's feet; it brings the fluent and ready speech and the ability to find the fitting and efficient word just when it is wanted. And all *that* every man needs, if he never speaks to more than one person at a time in his whole life. And the incidental advantages, such as the information that one gets about current affairs and the history of our country, are many and valuable.

But with all these advantages my experience as teacher in high school and college has convinced me that there are some great defects in the society system.

1. One defect I have already pointed out—that debating tends to induce the advocate's spirit and not the spirit of the impartial seeker after truth. Unaided in obtaining the right view of debating, the debater comes instinctively and without question to regard winning the debate as the chief end of his work. He is apt to carry this spirit out into the world with him, and to regard every public problem as a matter of partisanship; to select first his side and then seek for arguments to support it. He goes too often to swell the ranks of those who are unswerving party men on all public questions, instead of adding to the ranks of those real thinkers and investigators who know how to maintain their independence even within party lines. And it is the ranks of these citizens, who alone are the really good citizens, that the public school wants to serve.

This defect, however, springs largely from the fact that in general the members of these debating societies receive no help from their teachers. Think of it! How many good writers should we expect to turn out simply by seeing that our boys have an opportunity and occasion to write now and then, but given no instruction, no correction, no suggestion in the art of good writing? We know perfectly well that, though our boys might gain by the practice, they would always remain far below the line of possible attainment, and that they would be inculcating into themselves many a fault which could never afterward be eradicated. In writing English we have long since got past the point of allowing that.

This, then, is the remedy called for—or at least a partial remedy—that the teachers should give themselves to these societies in earnest training and help, and our school superintendents and school committees ought to see to it that there are teachers with time and ability sufficient to give such help. The boys must remain masters of their societies; the idea that the society is their recreation and not a mere school instrument must be fostered; but training in preparation and tactful compulsion to receive such training from the teachers must be forthcoming. The boy must be taught to see that his object in debating ought not to be primarily to win.

the debate, but to find out and make known the truth; that there is truth on both sides of almost every question; that as a debater it is his business to bring out whatever is true on his side and expose whatever is false on the other, leaving his opponent to do the same for his side; and he must be taught that, while his duty as speaker is that of the honest advocate, his duty to himself is to welcome the truth that his opponent discovers as much as that which he has found for himself.

Such teaching the wise teacher can largely give by showing the boy the necessity he is under of studying thoroughly his opponent's case, that he may meet his opponent's arguments where it is possible; a necessity which the untrained and uncriticised debater scarcely ever appreciates. Refutatory argument is mostly lacking in our high-school societies; the lack of it in the Harvard and Yale debates was severely criticised by Professor Percy Gardner a few years ago. It is one of the hardest things to produce in college debating classes, and we all know that the defect is pretty nearly as apparent in the discussions of men and women of mature years.

But *teach* a boy that, and what a gift you have given him! What else in his high-school course will send him farther on the way of devotion to the truth and the propagation of it?

2. The second defect of the untrained debater is like to the first, and, like it, is common everywhere, though most common with the untrained debater. That defect is the disregard for the necessity of proofs. High-school debaters, college debaters, debaters everywhere seem to think that a good, strong, "I tell you, gentlemen," is as good as the best evidence. Somebody must stand behind our young debaters as the slave stood behind triumphing Cæsar to warn him against too great pride, to thunder constantly in his ear: "Proofs, where are your proofs?" The boy must be taught that no argument is good which has not abundant evidence to support it. When honest and open-minded men differ about important questions it is not usually because they do not know the arguments and reasons offered on each side, but because they have not evidence enough. Three-fourths of our bother and difference over great

political and social questions is caused by lack of evidence. Teach the boy that when he gets out into the world he will find that it is facts which convince men, and that he is the master and controller of men's minds who offers not arguments merely, but facts and the arguments that fit those facts. The boy will never teach himself that. It is largely because he does not learn that that so many regard debating work as futile. It is the fault of the schools if it is futile: the sympathetic and interested teacher can teach the boy the necessity of facts.

The teacher can do more than this. He can make debating one of the greatest helps in teaching his boys to think. So much of our school work depends upon memory: in debating you can teach the boy to reason. The untrained debater's ideal is to find a few strong points on his side and present them effectively; you can teach him better than that. You can help him to find his material, and so teach him how to use books; you can teach him to analyze the question and see how much is necessary to prove his side; you can show him how to organize his separate points into an orderly, developed, and complete argument; you can lead him from an intellectual pecking at a question, which is all that nine hundred and ninety-nine men out of a thousand ever achieve, toward an intellectual grasp of a whole problem; you can, in short, teach him to reason, really to *think*.

I have spoken in favor of the debating society, but I think there ought to be some debating included in the regular school work. How much must depend on many circumstances. But in regular school work you could make certain of inculcating these principles of which I have spoken; you could bring into the work some who would not join the debating society; and you could use these discussions to add interest and value to your other work. What an opportunity there is for this in the teaching of history, of civics, of economics! How much additional information and insight as well as interest the participants in such debates would gain! A very large use of these discussions might be made to the double advantage of the subject in which the question lies and of training in power of expression.

If I were teaching American history, I should certainly have

debates on such topics as, "Was Adams or Jefferson the greater president?" "Has the spirit of compromise in our history been more harmful than helpful?" "Was the northern or southern view of our government the right one?" "Has the Republican party or the Democratic party done more for our country?" And there are a hundred equally good questions in all the departments I have mentioned. What invaluable reviews such discussions might be, and what supplement to the class work! Give a boy about to enter college the question, "Which was the greater writer, Homer or Virgil?" and would not he know more about the poetic power of these men than he had gained from all the linguistic study of his texts? It might even be that from the reading of Sellar's book on Virgil, or Symonds's book on the Greek poets, he would first really appreciate the fact that Homer and Virgil were poets,

Declamation.—Let us turn now for a few moments to consider work in declamation. Compared with debating, the case of declamation is both better and worse. It is better in that more of it is done in the school; it is worse in that, while untrained practice in debating, though it fails of much good, does comparatively little harm, untrained declamation works a very great amount of harm. Seventy-five per cent. of all the training in declamation given to Amherst freshmen has to be devoted to ridding them of certain faults—faults which if uncorrected will always prevent their speaking well, and faults which they never would have had if the high school had furnished them the proper training. Power in oral interpretation grows, of course, with the growth of the mind; but, so far as my observation goes, our grammar-school pupils are in some essentials better readers and reciters than our untrained high-school pupils. Until a boy is twelve or fourteen his personality, his notion of how the thing ought to be done, does not get in his way, does not get between him and his reading. He reads, if he is interested in the thing he is reading, unconsciously, with an eye single to what he is reading, and so he reads naturally, as we say, just like himself. But when the boy comes to be twelve or fourteen, especially when he becomes a member of a society,

he begins to form for himself a notion and ideal of what good speaking is. He becomes dimly conscious of a certain power in good speaking, of a certain power in his voice, which he would obtain, and, if he is left to himself, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred he gets a very false notion of how to obtain power. He comes consciously or unconsciously to think that if he talks like himself he can not get that power. And so in seeking for it he falls into a monotonous "tone," a "singing" like that of so many of our preachers, in which the natural variety of inflection, the natural subordination of the unimportant word and the relief and emphasis of the important word, directness, individuality are gone, and we get a great volume of noise, often on but two or three musical notes, which neither impress any idea upon us nor make us thrill with any feeling. That is the reason why to so many people "declamation" is a derogatory word, means "mere sound and fury, signifying nothing." Now, that is all wrong. Lack of training in the high school is largely responsible for it, and right here in the high school the fault ought to be killed, *must* be killed in those who get no further training, and in many who do; for the faults practiced into the boy during those all-important four years are often utterly ineradicable in the man. High-school training must make the effective speaker, as the lack of it is now making the ineffective speaker. There ought to be no *untrained* declamation in school or society. The boy ought to have some one to teach him that he never can speak well if he does not speak like himself; that Jones can never speak well if he tries to speak like Smith, or Smith if he tries to speak like Jones; that any real power he may acquire must be his, not somebody's else; that his good declamation is just his own natural way of conversing, raised to the *n*th power of expressiveness and impressiveness. Good public speaking, said John Churchill, is simply ennobled conversation. The boy must have somebody who can check him at every sentence with: "Jones, *you* don't talk that way. When you're coaching a man on first base you don't say, '*Get down with his arm,*' but '*Get down with his arm,*' you don't say on the football field, '*Fall on the ball,*' but '*Fall on the ball.*'"

With intelligent training, made effective by enthusiasm and a clear perception on the part of the trainer of the value of the work, the pupil will gain with every declamation in saying his say naturally, attractively, and impressively. For that is the work of declamation, to train the speaker—and everybody speaks, remember—in the use of that instrument, his voice, by means of which he is to make other men understand and believe in his beliefs, and feel as he feels. When he can take the ideas and feelings of another man, and get them into the minds and hearts of his listeners, then he will be able to give them his own ideas and feelings. And, believe me, not till then. Whatever the student may say, whatever teachers who do not teach speaking may think, the man who cannot first effectively convey the thoughts and feelings of others will not be able in later years effectively to convey his own.

Now, in what I have been saying about declamation I have regarded it as mere training toward a different end, as interpretation of another that one may eventually be able to interpret oneself. But does it not occur to some of you that oral interpretation of another's writing may be even to the adult man and woman a very noble end in itself? We study in school and college, and if we have really acquired culture of mind and soul, we read all our lives with joy the great poems and the great prose which immortal writers have given us. And surely this audience is the last in the world to deny an eager desire that our boys and girls may have this great source of life, may read good literature with understanding and with joy. For all real literature, whether prose or poetry, appeals not only to the intellect, but to the emotions, and makes its appeal, not by means of the eye only, but—something that most of us fail to realize—by means of the ear also. That is clear enough to us all when the words are what we call onomatopoeic, when the sound of the word conveys the sense. When the bees murmur in immemorial elms, when the clock in "Godiva" strikes with twelve great shocks of sound, when the echo flaps and buffets round the hills, we perceive that by their sound the words convey or suggest their sense. But all literature, poetry most of all, is in a

wide way onomatopoeic. Not words only, but phrases, sentences, paragraphs, convey or suggest ideas and feelings by their sound. We recognize that when we speak of the music of poetry, we perceive that some of its message is conveyed by tone. How much, how very much of that is lost when we use only the inward ear for our interpretation, when all the music, all the tone, comes to us strained, as it were, through the eye! The voice can do for the word what no printed letters can ever do. The trained voice alone can realize to the full that music and that rhythm which the artist wishes to use as an instrument of his message; so by the voice alone can that full message be conveyed. "A poem is not truly a poem," says Professor Corson, "until it is voiced by an accomplished reader who has adequately assimilated it." No literature can be appreciated which is not read well aloud.

If that is so, and if the power to read well can in all but the rarest cases come only through training in school and college, ought not we, who are struggling to teach an appreciation of English literature, first of all to make certain that what is now done shall not train in the wrong direction, and then to make every possible effort to train in the right direction? It is perfectly possible to add a great deal of reading and recitation to our school work even under present circumstances; and we shall do it just as soon as we come to realize that time so spent is not merely adding something that ought to be added, but actually helping us to accomplish what we are aiming at today, but what, if we are honest with ourselves, we must admit we often fail to accomplish.

I imagine that the teacher who is preparing boys for college-entrance examinations in English must admit that more often than any other. I, at least, had often to admit it when I was doing that work. These teachers have to work at times under the most hampering conditions. To teach literature to the literary-minded is hard enough, but the sane and healthy boy is not often a literary animal. And when, in defiance of all psychology and common-sense, our wise commission expects us to teach the boy to appreciate at his age such a work as Burke's *Conciliation with*

America, for instance, we may well despair. But in declamation we have a means of appealing to a boy's imagination, of teaching him literature, in which many a boy is interested, and more can be interested by a good and enthusiastic teacher. To declaim good literature well *is* to appreciate it. And what an opportunity the teacher of literature has with a boy who is willing to study a declamation and try to deliver it well! He has to learn to emphasize the right words: that means that he has to learn what words in every sentence carry the kernel of the thought, what words carry on the thought from sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph throughout the piece. He has to learn to grade the emphasis of sentences as a whole, of paragraphs as a whole; to learn crescendo and climax in emphasis: that means that he has to weigh the relative value and importance of the different thoughts. What a study is all this in literary construction and development! He has to learn to give the right variety of inflection and pitch to each word and sentence and paragraph: what a study that is, too, in sentence and paragraph building, in literary unity and harmony! He has to learn to give the right quality of tone to each word and sentence and paragraph: that means that he has to learn that each sentence and paragraph conveys, not only a *meaning*, but a *feeling* of its own. What a study that is of the emotional side of literature, of literature as an art! For the sake of the former of these things many a boy is willing to study the latter, and many, many times, I can assure you from my own experience, these latter things come to him as a perfect revelation. It seems to me often that I can see a boy in declamation rehearsals growing mentally and spiritually before my very eyes, As he strives to interpret with his voice he perceives thought and feeling that he has never seen before. As his voice responds more and more to his will, it conveys to him a sense of power which he has never felt. He catches fire, intellectually and emotionally, from the sound of his own voice. That rehearsal is to him a real education. So long as such rewards come to the teacher of declamation—and they come not rarely—his work may be tiring enough, but it can never be tiresome.

So it seems to me that into our English literature work we ought to welcome a great deal of oral reading and declamation. The teacher ought, as an indispensable condition to his teaching, to be himself an excellent reader, and he ought to read much to his pupils. From the works studied by the class he ought to have the members of the class read and recite as much as possible, but never without thorough training and rehearsals. *Julius Cæsar*, *Macbeth*, *The Merchant of Venice*, for instance, ought in different recitations and readings to be given nearly entire; *Ivanhoe* and *The Princess* can furnish many a declamation; such poems as *Lycidas* ought to be read aloud after very careful preparation; and even from the *Conciliation with America* selections can be made the delivery of which will give something of an appreciation that might otherwise be wholly lost. If you say that time cannot be given to this because examinations must be passed, I reply that no school authorities have any business to let college-entrance examinations prevent the best education in literature. The staff ought to be large enough to allow both kinds of work. And a second reply would be, what I have said before, that the more important thing won by this kind of work is very often a direct gain in the other kind of work.

Upon the teachers of other departments than English I should urge still more strongly in the case of declamation what I urged in the case of debates. How many splendid and illuminative declamations the teacher of history can find to brighten and intensify his work, and to give, as nothing else can give to the student, an appreciation and admiration of the great events and great men in our history! No student of American history, for instance, ought to study the battle of Gettysburg without hearing Lincoln's great speech well delivered, or read of Samuel Adams without hearing of Lodge's oration on the man of the town-meeting. Let the teacher of Cicero have Cicero's orations or parts of them delivered, well delivered, before his class; let the pupil in Virgil deliver the boat-race in the fourth book as he would the boat-race in *Tom Brown*; let the pupil in Homer deliver the Death of Hector as he would the Death of Wolfe.

That such training as I have suggested is really educative

must, I think, be apparent. But the highest education is the building of character. And here, too, I assert, training in speaking may be made to play a not unimportant part. When the boy has reached that point where he becomes possessed of a desire really to influence his associates, when he becomes ambitious to win his debates, when he is eager to acquire power in the affairs of his debating society, or class, or school, he sometimes experiences a lack of success which he finds it hard to account for. Who has not seen both boys and men that with attractive voices, with much of the grace and polish and technical skill, with much of the power of clear and vigorous thinking, that go to make the good speaker, fail to convince and move those who listen to them; while the listeners gladly submit to the sway of some harsh or weak-voiced speaker, awkward and rough in gesture and delivery, but whose thorough earnestness, whose manifest sincerity, show that his whole nature is possessed by the thing he is uttering? That situation occurs over and over again in college and in school, and therein lies the opportunity of the teacher. To show the boy that he is guilty of the fault of "fine-speaking"—if I may coin the term as a parallel to "fine-writing"—that he is insincere and unguine, that he is thinking of how he speaks rather than what he speaks—this to help build that boy's character. For you shall be able to show him that he is speaking to those who know him through and through, that they are testing always what he says by what he is, that he will never make them think and feel what he does not really and intensely think and feel, that he must make the choice between the success of *Æschines* and the success of *Demosthenes*. "You," said the great Greek to his rival, "you made them say, 'How well he speaks!' but I made them say, 'Let us march against Philip!'"

Last spring District Attorney Jerome said to me, as he passed on his way to the platform from which he with others was to address a great audience: "I do not see why it is that because I can do one sort of thing fairly well, people think I can do another wholly different kind of thing." He meant that he did not see why, because people though he would be a good district

attorney, they should think he could make a good after-dinner speech. But when it came to the test, when the others, men of reputation as speakers, had made their best efforts, Mr. Jerome alone really moved the audience, really stirred their feelings and gave an impulse to their wills. For, where the others had manifestly endeavored to be eloquent, he alone had seemed to be possessed, not *of* but *by* the thing he had to say, and uttered it with such plain, sincere directness, that in his words was felt the very soul of the man. It is the Jeromes, the Parkhursts, the Roosevelts, whom as speakers we ought to hold up as models to our boys; and so shall we be doing something toward making our boys what the Jeromes and Parkhursts and Roosevelts are as men; so perhaps shall we now and then find ourselves *hewing* one of "those grand sticks of human timber, all afire with holy indignation," of whom Dr. Parkhurst speaks; "men who feel iniquity keenly, and are not afraid to stand up and hammer it unflinchingly and remorselessly, and never get tired of hammering it;" and so prove, indeed, "instruments of God."

In closing, let me summarize briefly what I have tried to show—that there is too little work in oral expression in our high schools; that it is very little when compared with the work in what are recognized to be important educative subjects; that it is very little when compared with the work in written expression, though the demand of life for good talking is far greater than that for good writing; that the ideal of the high school, training for good citizenship, really *includes* training to speak well. I have urged that such training must include much practice in vocal calisthenics, in debating, declaiming; and that even in our overcrowded curricula this can be included to the large benefit of what is already there. I have suggested some ways in which this work should be done. And I have especially emphasized the dangers that lie in the prevalent condition in the schools of untrained debating and declaiming; the danger that untrained debating may cultivate the partisan spirit, while the pupil fails to learn how he must seek the truth if he is ever to find it; the danger, rather the certainty, that in untrained decla-

mation he will acquire ineradicable faults that will forever prevent his speaking really well.

I have tried to show that such training is training for the demands of everyday life; that it has real educative and culture value; that, indeed, conducted by the wise teacher, it has value in the building of character.

In what I have said I feel certain I have not been extravagant, but I know that you may think so. I am content if I have in any degree made clearer the necessity for a strong effort on the part of the high schools, that their graduates shall not be hampered in their growth as men and women, in their effectiveness as citizens and neighbors, because they have not been trained in the most common, constant and inevitable mode of expression.

GEORGE B. CHURCHILL.

AMHERST COLLEGE.